Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/759,160	KOHLHASE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SAMIRA JEAN-LOUIS	1617	

		CANNITO TOEANT EGGIC	1017
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE R	EPLY FILED <u>16 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.
á á f	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coeriods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) [The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing		
b) [2	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
have be under 3 set fortl may ree	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(cons of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date sen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exist CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the solin in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later duce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). CE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months of the date of
f N	iling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w DMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
(The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a) They raise new issues that would require further core b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT	
(They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially rec	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a new NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 		ected claims.
4. 🔲	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		
r	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	-
h 7 0	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) now the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 78-136. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		i be entered and an explanation of
	AVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
k	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		
€	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation EST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attached.
11. 🛚	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See continuation sheet.		condition for allowance because:
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	EENI PADMANABHAN/ rvisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1617		

Applicant's arguments with respect to the withdrawal of the finality of the rejection dated 04/16/08 due to the lack of clarity of the rejection and due to the non-consideration of the pearlescent property of the composition has been fully considered and is found non-persuasive. The Office Action dated 04/16/08 clearly sets forth an obviousness rejection over Riedel in view of Charlton. Examiner further stated what Riedel teaches and what was deficient in Riedel and how Charlton overcame this deficiency. While a typographical error was made on page 8 (i.e. Chapin), it is clear from the Charlton reference that Charlton teaches sodium hydroxide in the composition. Consequently, applicant's arguments of unclarity is not persuasive given the Office Action clearly stated the two references and what they taught. As to the pearlescent effect not considered, Examiner respectfully points out that intended use and physical properties are not given patentable weight. Given that pearlescence is a property of the composition and Riedel teaches the same composition as applicant's, the composition of Riedel in view of Charlton would necessarily possess the same pearlescent properties as applicant given that properties are inseparable from the composition.

Applicant's arguments that Riedel teaches polymers in general and no specific associative polymers and amphiphilic polymers has been fully considered but is not found persuasive. Examiner respectfully disagrees that Riedel does not teach the aforementioned polymers given that Riedel teaches the use of polymers or mixtures thereof in the composition. In fact, Riedel teaches various polymers including acrylate/C10-30 -alkyl acrylate cross polymer as emulsifiers that can be added to the composition. While Riedel does not explicitly teach such polymer as an amphiphilic polymer, applicant himself states on the record that such polymer is an amphiphilic polymer (see pg. 9, table 1). Thus, one of ordinary skill can immediately envisaged adding such polymer as Riedel teaches its use in his composition. Moreover, Riedel teaches the use of Abil Wax 9840 in the composition. Again, Riedel did not explicitly state that such polymer is a siloxane elastomer, however, Examiner would like to cite Evonik Industries data sheet of Abil Wax 9840 which clearly describes Abil Wax 9840 as liquid to Waxy organopolysiloxane (i.e. siloxane) that are synthesized by linking polydimethyl siloxane (i.e. polymer) with long chain of hydrocarbons and possesses good spreadability (i.e. polymer with elasticity) and feels good to the skin (see pg. 2) and this necessarily meets applicant's definition of a siloxane elastomer defined in the specification on page 11. Additionally, Examiner further points out that claims 78-79 and 120 only requires the limitation of at least one polymer whether associative, amphiphilic or siloxane elastomer which Riedel necessarily meets. While applicant's intention of Abil Wax 9840 was for the purpose of an oil component, based on appllicant's definition of a siloxane elastomer Abil Wax 9840 necessarily meets the limitation of a siloxane elastomer and necessarily reads on claims 132-133.

Applicant's arguments that the Charlton reference is to a water-wetted skin composition that is contrastingly different from Riedel's composition and therefore would not have render obvious addition of Charlton's ingredients in its composition has been fully considered but is not found persuasive. Examiner points out that Charlton was provided to demonstrate that dermatological (i.e. skin) composition can contain neutralizing agents and stabilizing agents such as Stabylen 30 which is commonly known in the art as acrylate/vinyl isodenaote crosspolymer. Examiner refers applicant to the Sine et al. U.S. Patent 6,183,766 B1 published on February 6,2001 prior to applicant's invention which clearly teaches Stabilen 30 as acrylate/vinyl isodenaote crosspolymer (see col. 11, line 14). Again, while Charlton and Sine et al. did not explicitly states that Stabylen 30 is an amphiphillic polymer, applicant himself states on the record that acrylate/vinyl isodenaote crosspolymer is an amphiphilic polymer, therefore Charlton necessarily teaches a composition containing an amphiphilic polymer since Charlton teaches the exact same polymer as applicant. Regarding applicant's arguments that tromethamine is the neutralizing agent in Charlton and not sodium hydroxide is not persuasive given that Charlton explicitly teaches other neutralizing agents that can be added include sodium hydroxide.

Applicant's arguments that Riedel does not teach a composition substantially free of mono and di-fatty esters of glycerol and glycol has been fully considered but is not found persuasive. Given that applicant did not provide a definition of what is regarded as substantially free or the critical limitation encompassed by the term, Examiner concludes that Ridel's addition of 0.2-10% mono and/or digylcerides of fatty acids is substantially free of such compounds (see abstract part (b) and col. 17, claim 1).